UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/188,492	11/09/98	BAE S	33012-250-10

TM02/0807

CHARLES A JOHNSON
UNISYS CORPORATION
P O BOX 64942
MS 4772
ST PAUL MN 55164

EXAMINER	
WASSUM, L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2177	

DATE MAILED: 08/07/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/188,492	BAE, SEONGHO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Luke S. Wassum	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 25 June 2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/188,492 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Response to Amendment

2. Receipt of Pre-Amendment C filed 25 June 2001 is acknowledged.

3. As a result of the Pre-Amendment, independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are now presented for examination.

Drawings

4. As a result of the entry of the substitute specification, all pending objections to the drawings are withdrawn by the examiner.

Specification

5. As a result of the entry of the substitute specification, all pending objections to the specification are withdrawn by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wright et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,004,276) in view of **Maine** (U.S. Patent 5,673,256).

8. Regarding claims 1, 6 and 16, **Wright et al.** teaches a data processing system substantially as claimed, comprising:

a) a user terminal (see col. 14, line 52 through col. 15, line 19);

b) a publicly accessible digital communications network (see col. 13, lines 18-40);

c) a database management system on a server (see col. 14, lines 31-33); and

d) a report generated in response to a signal not initiated by said user terminal (see discussion of Report Scheduling and Generation, col. 46, line 45 through col. 49, line 13, and particularly col. 48, line 66 through col. 49, line 13; see also Figures 25A and 25B).

Wright et al. does not teach a data processing system wherein the server spools said report for future delivery.

Maine, however, teaches a data processing system wherein the server spools said report for future delivery (see col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 6; see also col. 2, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to schedule reports for delivery at some time in the future, since it is often advantageous to delay

transmission of messages, data files or reports in order to minimize costs or to utilize the network during times of lower network loading, and therefore higher bandwidth availability (see col. 1, lines 13-36).

9. Regarding claims 2 and 7, **Wright et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system comprising a plurality of user terminals (see col. 10, lines 59-67) and wherein said server electronically delivers said report to said plurality of user terminals (see col. 46, lines 45-59).

10. Regarding claim 8, **Maine** additionally teaches a data processing system comprising a repository for storing said report for later electronic delivery to said plurality of user terminals (see col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 6; see also col. 5, lines 4-8).

11. Further regarding claim 8, **Wright et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system comprising a repository for storing said report for later electronic delivery to said plurality of user terminals (see col. 47, lines 19-65).

12. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wright et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,004,276) in view of **Maine** (U.S. Patent 5,673,256) as applied to claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 16 above, and further in view of **Kitain et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,864,871).

13. Regarding claims 3, 9 and 17, **Wright et al.** and **Maine** teach a data processing system substantially as claimed.

Neither **Wright et al.** nor **Maine** teach a data processing system wherein said publicly accessible digital communications network is the world wide web.

Kitain et al., however, teaches a data processing system wherein said publicly accessible digital communications network is the world wide web (see col. 11, lines 26-31; see also col. 13, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to connect the plurality of user terminals to the server via the world wide web, since such networks enable information to be distributed to a wide range of people around the world while using communications protocols that are non-proprietary (see col. 1, lines 39-46).

14. Regarding claims 4 and 18, **Maine** additionally teaches a data processing system comprising a repository for storing said report for later electronic delivery to said plurality of user terminals (see col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 6; see also col. 5, lines 4-8).

15. Further regarding claims 4 and 18, **Wright et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system comprising a repository for storing said report for later electronic delivery to said plurality of user terminals (see col. 47, lines 19-65).

16. Regarding claim 10, **Kitain et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system wherein said user terminal is an industry standard compatible personal computer having a web browser (see col. 5, lines 41-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an industry standard compatible personal computer with a web browser, since such a computer is widely available and enables access to the world wide web.

17. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wright et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,004,276) in view of **Maine** (U.S. Patent 5,673,256) in view of **Rogers et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,094,655).

18. Regarding claim 11, **Wright et al.** teaches a data processing system substantially as claimed, comprising:

a) a user terminal (see col. 14, line 52 through col. 15, line 19);

b) a database management system on a server (see col. 14, lines 31-33);

c) automatically generating a report at a predetermined time (see discussion of Report Scheduling and Generation, col. 46, line 45 through col. 49, line 13, and particularly col. 48, line 66 through col. 49, line 13; see also Figures 25A and 25B);

d) making a service request from said user terminal to said database management system (see col. 48, lines 33-65); and

e) transmitting said report from said database management system to said user terminal (see col. 48, lines 33-65).

Wright et al. does not teach a data processing system wherein the server spools said report for future delivery.

Maine, however, teaches a data processing system wherein the server spools said report for future delivery (see col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 6; see also col. 2, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to schedule reports for delivery at some time in the future, since it is often advantageous to delay transmission of messages, data files or reports in order to minimize costs or to utilize the network during times of lower network loading, and therefore higher bandwidth availability (see col. 1, lines 13-36).

Neither **Wright et al.** nor **Maine** teach a data processing system wherein said report is converted into HTML.

Rogers et al., however, teaches a data processing system wherein said report is converted into HTML (see col. 17, lines 42-48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to format a report in HTML, since this would make the report readable by a wide variety of users on a variety of platforms, HTML being the industry standard for formatting documents to be read by a web browser.

19. Regarding claim 12, **Wright et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system wherein said user terminal is an industry standard compatible personal computer (see col. 3, lines 17-18; see also col. 14, line 52 through col. 15, line 38.

20. Regarding claim 13, **Wright et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system comprising a plurality of user terminals (see col. 10, lines 59-67).

21. Regarding claim 14, **Rogers et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system wherein said transmitting step further comprises transmitting over the world wide web (see col. 1, lines 54-60; see also col. 5, lines 60-67; see also Figure 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to connect the plurality of user terminals to the server via the world wide web, since such networks enable information to be distributed to a wide range of people around the world while using communications protocols that are non-proprietary.

22. Claims 5, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wright et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,004,276) in view of **Maine** (U.S. Patent 5,673,256) in view of **Kitain et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,864,871) as applied to claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 17 and 18 above, and further in view of **Admission** (Admitted Prior Art).

23. Regarding claims 5 and 19, **Wright et al.**, **Maine** and **Kitain et al.** teach a data processing system substantially as claimed.

None of **Wright et al.**, **Maine** and **Kitain et al.** teach a data processing system wherein said generating means further comprises CLASSIC MAPPER database management system.

Admission, however, teaches the CLASSIC MAPPER database management system (see applicant's specification [as amended], page 4, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the CLASSIC MAPPER database management system, since it is admitted as prior art that CLASSIC MAPPER is one of the most successful database management systems (see page 4, lines 9-12).

24. Regarding claim 20, **Wright et al.** additionally teaches a data processing system wherein said user terminal is an industry standard compatible personal computer (see col. 3, lines 17-18; see also col. 14, line 52 through col. 15, line 38.

25. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wright et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,004,276) in view of **Maine** (U.S. Patent 5,673,256) in view of **Rogers et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,094,655) as applied to claims 11-14 above, and further in view of **Admission** (Admitted Prior Art).

26. Regarding claim 15, **Wright et al.**, **Maine** and **Rogers et al.** teach a data processing system substantially as claimed.

None of **Wright et al.**, **Maine** and **Rogers et al.** teach a data processing system wherein said generating means further comprises CLASSIC MAPPER database management system.

Admission, however, teaches the CLASSIC MAPPER database management system (see applicant's specification [as amended], page 4, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the CLASSIC MAPPER database management system, since it is admitted as prior art that CLASSIC MAPPER is one of the most successful database management systems (see page 4, lines 9-12).

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent 6,208,266) teaches a system having an administration controller which could at predetermined times cause the report generator to generate utility usage reports for distribution to a number of utility companies.

Beyers, II et al. (U.S. Patent 5,420,923) teaches a system for scheduling the future transmission of messages to an individual or to members of a group.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6606 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
August 1, 2001

JEAN R. HOMERE
PRIMARY EXAMINER